

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
EASTERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

vs.

Criminal Action 2:25-cr-067  
JUDGE MICHAEL H. WATSON

ALBERTO CAICEROS-CRUZ

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

The United States and defendant Alberto Caiceros-Cruz entered into a Fast-Track Plea Agreement, *Plea Agreement*, ECF No. 17, executed under the provisions of Fed. R. Crim. P. 11(c)(1)(C), whereby defendant agreed to plead guilty to an *Information*, ECF No. 16, charging him with the illegal reentry of a removed alien in violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1326(a).<sup>1</sup> On May 28, 2025, defendant personally appeared with his counsel for an arraignment and entry of guilty plea proceeding.<sup>2</sup>

Defendant waived his right to an indictment in open court and after being advised of the nature of the charge and of his rights. See Fed. R. Crim P. 7(b).

Defendant consented, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(3), to enter a guilty plea before a Magistrate Judge. See *United States v. Cukaj*, 25 Fed. Appx. 290, 291(6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2001) (Magistrate Judge may accept a guilty plea with the express consent of the defendant and where no objection to the report and recommendation is filed).

During the plea proceeding, the undersigned observed the appearance and responsiveness of defendant in answering questions.

---

<sup>1</sup> In addition to specifying certain sentencing terms, the *Plea Agreement* includes an appellate waiver provision that preserves only certain claims for appeal, collateral challenge, or motion for reduction of sentence. In the *Plea Agreement*, defendant acknowledged the likely immigration consequences of his guilty plea.

<sup>2</sup> A Spanish interpreter was available throughout the hearing but defendant, who appears to be fluent in English, did not rely on the interpreter.

Based on that observation, the undersigned is satisfied that, at the time he entered his guilty plea, defendant was in full possession of his faculties, was not suffering from any apparent physical or mental illness, and was not under the influence of narcotics, other drugs, or alcohol.

Prior to accepting defendant's plea, the undersigned addressed defendant personally and in open court and determined his competence to plead. Based on the observations of the undersigned, defendant understands the nature and meaning of the charge in the *Information* and the consequences of his plea of guilty to that charge. Defendant was also addressed personally and in open court and advised of each of the rights referred to in Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure.

Having engaged in the colloquy required by Rule 11, the Court concludes that defendant's plea is voluntary. Defendant acknowledged that the *Plea Agreement* signed by him, his attorney, and the attorney for the United States and filed on April 24, 2025, represents the only promises made by anyone regarding the charge in the *Information*. Defendant was advised that the District Judge may accept or reject the *Plea Agreement*. Defendant was further advised that, if the District Judge refuses to accept the *Plea Agreement*, defendant will have the opportunity to withdraw his guilty plea but that, if he does not withdraw his guilty plea under those circumstances, the District Judge may impose a sentence that is more severe than the sentence contemplated in the *Plea Agreement*, up to the statutory maximum.

Defendant confirmed the accuracy of the statement of facts supporting the charge, which is attached to the *Plea Agreement*. He confirmed that he is pleading guilty to Count 1 of the *Information* because he is in fact guilty of that crime. The Court concludes that there is a factual basis for the plea.

The Court concludes that defendant's plea of guilty to Count 1 of the *Information* is knowingly and voluntarily made with understanding

of the nature and meaning of the charge and of the consequences of the plea.

It is therefore **RECOMMENDED** that defendant's guilty plea to Count 1 of the *Information* be accepted.

Decision on acceptance or rejection of the *Plea Agreement* was deferred for consideration by the District Judge after review of the *Presentence Investigation Report*, ECF No. 22.

If any party seeks review by the District Judge of this *Report and Recommendation*, that party may, within fourteen (14) days, file and serve on all parties objections to the *Report and Recommendation*, specifically designating this *Report and Recommendation*, and the part thereof in question, as well as the basis for objection thereto. 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1); F.R. Civ. P. 72(b). Response to objections must be filed within fourteen (14) days after being served with a copy thereof. F.R. Civ. P. 72(b).

The parties are specifically advised that failure to object to the *Report and Recommendation* will result in the forfeiture of the right to *de novo* review by the District Judge and of the right to appeal the decision of the District Court adopting the *Report and Recommendation*. See *United States v. Wandahsega*, 924 F.3d 868, 878 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2019); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985).

May 28, 2025  
Date

s/ Norah McCann King  
Norah McCann King  
United States Magistrate Judge